



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,474	09/15/2003	Kenneth W. Shirriff	15437-0641	3748
45657 7590 07/18/2008 HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP AND SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC. 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089				
EXAMINER				
GILLIS, BRIAN J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2141				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/663,474
Filing Date: September 15, 2003
Appellant(s): SHIRRIFF ET AL.

Samuel S. Broda
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 11, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed November 8, 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is incorrect.

The amendment after final rejection filed on January, 21, 2008 has been entered.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows: Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-13, 17-20, 22-23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,748,884 ("Royce") in view of Chen.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2004/0119736	Chen et al	6-2004
5,748,884	Royce et al	5-1998
6,823,359	Heidingsfeld et al	11-2004
2003/0037136	Labovitz et al	2-2003
2004/0111507	Villado et al	6-2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 45-49, 52-57 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al (US PGPUB US2004/0119736).

(Claim 45 discloses) a machine-implemented method, comprising: obtaining, from a server, a set of status information pertaining to one or more components (Chen et al shows a server obtains event information (paragraph 21).); rendering a display to

show the status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the administrative workstation displays the event information (paragraph 22).); accessing an event buffer, wherein the event buffer stores one or more events pertaining to the one or more components (Chen et al shows a database stores information about the events (paragraph 21).); determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events that require the display to be updated (Chen et al shows after an event is detected it is determined if it is an event to be displayed (paragraph 22).); in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events that require the graphic display to be updated, obtaining from the server a set of updated status information pertaining to the one or more components (Chen et al shows the event is obtained from the server and displayed by the administrative workstation (paragraph 22).); and rendering an updated display to show the updated status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the display is updated (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 46 discloses) the method of claim 45, wherein the one or more components are one or more nodes in a cluster of nodes (Chen et al shows a plurality of network devices or nodes are connected to the network (paragraph 19)).

(Claim 47 discloses) the method of claim 45, wherein the server is a web server, and wherein obtaining the set of status information comprises: loading a web page from the web server that includes the status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the event information is displayed on a web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 48 discloses) the method of claim 47, wherein obtaining the set of updated status information comprises: loading an updated web page from the web server that includes the updated status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the updated event information is updated on the web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 49 discloses) the method of claim 47, wherein loading the web page comprises: registering a set of one or more pertinent events as events that require the display to be updated (Chen et al shows the event is determined whether to be displayed on the web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 52 discloses) the method of claim 49, wherein determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events that require the display to be updated comprises: determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events (Chen et al shows a new event is detected in the database (paragraphs 21 and 22).); and in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events, determining whether any of the one or more newly added events is one of the events in the set of one or more pertinent events (Chen et al shows if a new event is needed to be displayed it is a pertinent event (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 53 discloses) an apparatus, comprising: means for obtaining, from a server, a set of status information pertaining to one or more components (Chen et al shows a server obtains event information (paragraph 21).); means for rendering a display to show the status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the administrative workstation displays the event information (paragraph 22).);

means for accessing an event buffer, wherein the event buffer stores one or more events pertaining to the one or more components (Chen et al shows a database stores information about the events (paragraph 21).); means for determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events that require the display to be updated (Chen et al shows after an event is detected it is determined if it is an event to be displayed (paragraph 22).); means for obtaining from the server, in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events that require the graphic display to be updated, a set of updated status information pertaining to the one or more components (Chen et al shows the event is obtained from the server and displayed by the administrative workstation (paragraph 22).); and means for rendering an updated display to show the updated status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the display is updated (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 54 discloses) the apparatus of claim 53, wherein the one or more components are one or more nodes in a cluster of nodes (Chen et al shows a plurality of network devices or nodes are connected to the network (paragraph 19)).

(Claim 55 discloses) the apparatus of claim 53, wherein the server is a web server, and wherein the means for obtaining the set of status information comprises: means for loading a web page from the web server that includes the status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the event information is displayed on a web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 56 discloses) the apparatus of claim 55, wherein the means for obtaining the set of updated status information comprised: means for loading an updated web

page from the web server that includes the updated status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the updated event information is updated on the web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 57 discloses) the apparatus of claim 55, wherein the means for loading the web page comprises: means for registering a set of one or more pertinent events as events that require the display to be updated (Chen et al shows the event is determined whether to be displayed on the web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 60 discloses) the apparatus of claim 57, wherein the means for determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events that require the display to be updated comprises: means for determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events (Chen et al shows a new event is detected in the database (paragraphs 21 and 22).); and means for determining, in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events, whether any of the one or more newly added events is one of the events in the set of one or more pertinent events (Chen et al shows if a new event is needed to be displayed it is a pertinent event (paragraph 22)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-13, 17-20, 22, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US PG PUB US2004/0119736).

Claim 1 discloses a system for event notification, comprising: an event buffer; a first node, the first node detecting a situation of interest on the first node and generating a first event in response thereto, the first node sending information pertaining to the first event to the event buffer to be stored therein; and a remote computing system, the remote computing system displaying a first set of status information for the first node that was previously obtained from a server, the remote computing system polling the event buffer for new events and in response to detecting the first event, the remote computing system interacting again with the server to obtain therefrom a set of updated status information for the first node, the remote computing system thereafter displaying the updated status information. Royce et al teaches detecting an event which triggers a notice to be generated and transmitted (column 4, lines 25-35) and the outboard

console personal computer (OBCP) receives the event notice and transmits the notice (column 4, lines 37-41). It fails to teach an event buffer and a remote computing system, the remote computing system displaying a first set of status information for the first node that was previously obtained from a server, the remote computing system polling the event buffer for new events and in response to detecting the first event, the remote computing system interacting again with the server to obtain therefrom a set of updated status information for the first node, the remote computing system thereafter displaying the updated status information. Chen et al teaches a database is used to store event information (paragraph 21), and an administrative workstation obtains the event information and if a new event is detected and determined to be displayed the event is displayed (paragraphs 21 and 22).

Royce et al and Chen et al are analogous art because they are both related to event notification.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the computing system features in Chen et al with the system in Royce et al because relevant events are able to be monitored remotely and information is displayed in real time (Chen, paragraph 9).

Claim 2 discloses the system for event notification of claim 1 wherein the event buffer comprises a database for storing received events. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a database (paragraph 21).

Claim 6 discloses the system for event notification of claim 1 further comprising: a second node, the second node detecting a situation of interest on the second node

and generating a second event in response thereto, the second node sending information pertaining to the second event to the event buffer to be stored therein. Royce et al further teaches multiple nodes, which detects an event, which triggers a notice, to be generated and transmitted (figure 2, column 4, lines 25-35) and the OBCP receives the event notice and transmits the notice (column 4, lines 37-41).

Claim 7 discloses the system for event notification of claim 6 wherein the event buffer comprises a database for storing received events. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a database (paragraph 21).

Claim 11 discloses the system for event notification of claim 6 wherein the second node comprises a second event buffer, and wherein the second event buffer receives events transmitted from at least one of the first node and the second node. Royce et al further teaches the system can have multiple devices monitoring (figure 2).

Claim 12 discloses the system for event notification of claim 11 wherein the event buffer comprises a first list of significant events and wherein the second event buffer comprises a second list of significant events. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a buffer (paragraph 21).

Claim 13 discloses the system for event notification of claim 1 wherein the remote computing system renders a graphic display to show the first set of status information and/or the updated status information. Chen et al further teaches the display is a graphic display (figure 7, paragraph 28).

Claim 17 discloses the system for event notification of claim 13 wherein the graphic display is rendered by an application that is integrated with at least one of an

event monitor, and the event buffer. Chen et al further teaches the event-setting module is integrated with a database (paragraphs 21 and 23).

Claim 18 discloses a network for event notification, comprising: an event forwarding mechanism in each node of a cluster for forwarding detected events to each other node; an event buffer of said cluster to receive and store each event forwarded from a node from an event forwarding mechanism; and a remote event monitor for periodically polling said event buffer for changes in pertinent events, and in response to detecting one or more new pertinent events, the remote event monitor causing updated status information pertaining to one or more nodes in said cluster to be obtained from a server and causing the updated status information to be displayed. Royce et al teaches the OBCP receives an event notice and transmits the notice through the network (column 4, lines 37-41). It fails to teach an event buffer of said cluster to receive and store each event forwarded from a node from an event forwarding mechanism; and a remote event monitor for periodically polling said event buffer for changes in pertinent events, and in response to detecting one or more new pertinent events, the remote event monitor causing updated status information pertaining to one or more nodes in said cluster to be obtained from a server and causing the updated status information to be displayed. Chen et al teaches storing the events by the obtaining module (paragraph 21) and an administrative workstation obtains the event information and if a new event is detected and determined to be displayed the event is displayed (paragraphs 21 and 22).

Royce et al and Chen et al are analogous art because they are both related to event notification.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the computing system features in Chen et al with the system in Royce et al because relevant events are able to be monitored remotely and information is displayed in real time (Chen, paragraph 9).

Claim 19 discloses the network of claim 18 further comprising: an event generation mechanism in each node to generate an event when something of interest occurs within said cluster. Royce et al further teaches detecting an event, which triggers an event notice, which is transmitted to the OBCP (column 4, lines 25-35).

Claim 20 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said updated status information is displayed within a web page. Chen et al further teaches the display is a web page (paragraph 21).

Claim 22 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said remote event monitor resides within a browser system. Chen et al further teaches the administrative work station is a browser system (paragraph 26).

Claim 23 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said remote event buffer is located on at least one node in a cluster. Chen et al further teaches the database is stored on the administrative workstation (paragraph 21).

Claim 25 discloses the network of claim 20 wherein said web page registers pertinent events with said remote event monitor. Chen et al further teaches the pertinent events can be determined using the web page (paragraph 26).

Claims 3-5, 8-10, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US PGPUB US2004/0119736) as applied to claims 1, and 18 above, and further in view of Labovitz et al (US PGPUB US 2003/0037136).

Claim 3 discloses the system for event notification of claim 2 wherein the database is pruned. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 2 as recited above. It fails to teach the database being pruned. Labovitz et al teaches the database is pruned (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claim 4 discloses the system for event notification of claim 3 wherein the pruning is carried out at timed intervals. Labovitz et al further teaches the database is pruned periodically (paragraph 127).

Claim 5 discloses the system for event notification of claim 4 wherein the pruning is carried out at said time intervals of between 2 and 120 seconds. Labovitz et al further teaches the frequency the database is pruned is configurable (paragraph 127).

Claim 8 discloses the system for event notification of claim 7 wherein the database is pruned. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 7

as recited above. It fails to teach the database being pruned. Labovitz et al teaches the database is pruned (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claim 9 discloses the system for event notification of claim 8 wherein the pruning is carried out at timed intervals. Labovitz et al further teaches the database is pruned periodically (paragraph 127).

Claim 10 discloses the system for event notification of claim 9 wherein the pruning is carried out at said time intervals of between 2 and 120 seconds. Labovitz et al further teaches the frequency the database is pruned is configurable (paragraph 127).

Claim 21 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said event buffer further comprises: a database for storing events received from said event forwarding mechanisms; and an evictor for periodically removing events from said database. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a database (paragraph 21). It fails to teach an evictor for periodically removing events from said database. Labovitz et al teaches pruning the database periodically (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claims 14-16 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US PGPUB US2004/0119736) as applied to claims 1, and 18 above, and further in view of Heidingsfeld et al (US Patent #6,823,359).

Claim 14 discloses the system for event notification of claim 13 wherein the graphic display is rendered by a stand-alone application. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 13 as recited above. It fails to teach the graphic display is a stand-alone application. Heidingsfeld et al teaches the display is a stand-alone application (column 5, lines 37-43).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the display stand-alone feature in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 15 discloses the system for event notification of claim 13 wherein the graphic display is a web page rendered by a web browser. Chen et al further teaches the display is on a web page (paragraph 21).

Claim 16 discloses the system for event notification of claim 15 wherein the web browser comprises plug-ins. Heidingsfeld et al further teaches the web browser comprises plug-ins (figure 7).

Claim 26 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said updated status information is displayed in a frame of a displayed web page. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. It fails to teach the information is in a frame of a displayed web page. Heidingsfeld et al teaches updating a frame of a web page (column 5, lines 50-64).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the frame updating feature in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US PGPUB US2004/0119736) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Villado et al (US PGPUB US2004/0111507).

Claim 24 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said remote event monitor is a Java applet operating on a computing system remote from said cluster. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. It fails to teach the remote event monitor being a Java applet operating on a computing system remote from said cluster. Villado et al teaches the monitoring may be implemented using JAVA remotely (paragraph 63).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Villado et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the implementation of JAVA remotely feature in Villado et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because network monitoring is improved by enabling an authorized user to view communications passing through a network in real time (Villado, paragraph 8).

Claims 50, 51, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al (US PGPUB US2004/0119736) in view of Heidingsfeld et al (US Patent #6,823,359).

Claim 50 discloses the method of claim 49, wherein the web page comprises code for causing the set of one or more pertinent events to be registered. Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 49 as recited above. It fails to teach the web page comprises code for causing the set of one or more pertinent events to be registered. Heidingsfeld et al teaches the web page has code to update information (column 2, lines 24-28).

Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the web page code features in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 51 discloses the method of claim 50, wherein the code is Javascript code. Heidingsfeld et al further teaches the code used is Javascript (column 2, lines 24-28).

Claim 58 discloses the apparatus of claim 57, wherein the web page comprises code for causing the set of one or more pertinent events to be registered. Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 57 as recited above. It fails to teach the web page comprises code for causing the set of one or more pertinent events to be registered. Heidingsfeld et al teaches the web page has code to update information (column 2, lines 24-28).

Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the web page code features in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 59 discloses the apparatus of claim 58, wherein the code is Javascript code. Heidingsfeld et al further teaches the code used is Javascript (column 2, lines 24-28).

(10) Response to Argument

Issue I

Claims 45-49, 52-57, and 60

Applicant asserts the prior art does not disclose or suggest the feature obtaining, from a server, a set of status information pertaining to one or more components. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, Chen et al shows information is obtained by the administrative workstation which is interpreted to be a server from the network devices and is stored in a database (paragraphs 21 and 22).

Applicant asserts the prior art does not disclose or suggest the feature in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events that require the display to be updated, obtaining from the server a set of updated status information pertaining to the one or more components. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, Chen et al shows when a new event is detected the server obtains the information from the network device and stores the information in the database. The display is then updated with the newly obtained information from the server (paragraphs 21 and 22).

Issue II

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-13, and 17

Applicant asserts the prior art does not teach or suggest the feature, the remote computing system polling the event buffer for new events and in response to detecting the first event, the remote computing system interacting again with the server to obtain therefrom a set of updated status information for the first node, the remote computing system thereafter displaying the updated status information. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, Chen et al teaches the administrative workstation interpreted to be a server interacts with the database stored on the server which contains the updated device information and stores newly updated device information in the database when such information is detected. The updated information is then retrieved from the database to be used to update the display (paragraphs 21 and 22).

Claims 18-20, 22-23, and 25

Applicant asserts the prior art does not teach or suggest the feature, in response to detecting one or more new pertinent events, the remote event monitor causing updated status information pertaining to one or more nodes in said cluster to be obtained from a server and causing the updated status information to be displayed. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, Chen et al teaches when a new event is detected the server obtains the information from the network device and stores the information in the database. The display is then updated with the newly obtained information from the server (paragraphs 21 and 22).

Art Unit: 2141

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/B. J. G./

Brian Gillis
Examiner
Art Unit 2141
7/16/2008

Conferees:

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2141
/Rupal D. Dharia/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2141